

# **HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

## **Minutes**

July 14, 2008

The Historic Preservation Commission for the City of Salisbury met in regular session on Thursday, July 14<sup>th</sup> in the Council Chambers at the City Hall, 217 S. Main Street.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairperson, Anne Lyles. She read the purpose and procedure for the meeting.

In addition to Anne Lyles, the following members were present and introduced: Jack Errante, Ronald Fleming, Susan Hurt, Deborah Johnson, Judy Kandl, Kathy Walters, Anne Waters

Absent: Andrew Pitner

### **Special Presentation**

H-00-08 – Wendy Spry, applicant

Wendy Spry, a former staff liaison, was surprised when a mock Certificate of Appropriateness was presented to her along with a gift from the Commission. The presentation was made by Janet Gapen who expressed the Commission's sentiments on her recent promotion to the Salisbury-Rowan Utilities Department.

Ms. Spry graciously accepted her gift and stated how much she had enjoyed working with everyone on the Commission. She promised to keep in touch.

### **Requests for Certificates of Appropriateness**

**H-19-08 322 E. Council St.** – Cheerwine Homeowners Association, owner  
Celia L. Goin, applicant

**Request:** Replacement of garage door

Celia Goin, applicant and Janet Gapen, staff, were sworn in give testimony for the request.

Ms. Goin informed the Commission that the garage door on the front of the Cheerwine building needed to be replaced. Staff presented slides as Ms. Goin described the condition of the existing door which was put on in 2000. She testified that the roll-up insulated door is very heavy because of 1" thick wooden panels that had been screwed onto the door. She stated that after being jammed in an upward position the door had to be pulled down and power shut off. Ms. Goin also informed the Commission that garage is the interior parking for residents in the building and also houses the storage units.

In researching the history of the building, Ms. Goin said the original building was built in 1917 but the garage section of the building was built at a later time. She said she has not been successful in finding any pictures of the original door, nor did the Cheerwine Company.

She presented a CAD drawing of the proposed 12 x 15 ft. door which has 7 panels. The drawing also showed a row of glass eliminated from the top since it will be 11 ft. off the ground. She stated that the proposed door looks like wood but it is a premier steel carriage-house type door that is very sturdy and would have easier maintenance. She further testified that they would not have the funds to replace the door with a true wooden door. She also noted that the other buildings in the area have the basic commercial roll-up doors which would have to be completely reconfigured to work with their building's existing motor and equipment. The existing back door, she stated, is metal.

She informed the Commission that the door needs to be replaced as soon as possible for the safety and security of the residents and the property inside the building's lobby.

In response to a question from Anne Lyles, Ms. Goin said a steel door would not be as heavy as a wood door. The existing wood door, she said, is extra heavy because of the wood panels that had been bolted on it.

Staff presented slides of the rear door which is a basic metal roll-up garage door and also of garage doors on various buildings in the area of the district – E. Liberty St., E. Council St., Depot St., N. Lee St. She stated that some are wood doors and others steel doors.

In response to Jack Errante who asked if the front door was accessible, Ms. Goin said it is accessible but kept locked for security. She said, "If you are a resident you do have a key to the outside door."

## **Public Hearing**

There was no one present to speak in support or opposition to the request.

## **Deliberation**

Susan Hurt began the discussion by asking Ms. Goin why she had chosen a steel door that looked like wood since the area is mixed between residential and commercial.

Ms. Goin said because of the difference in cost. She stated a wood door would have to be custom made and would cost a lot more than the steel door that looks like wood. Also, she continued, "with steel there would be less trouble with rot."

Susan Hurt asked, "Why not a steel door that looks like steel?"

Ms. Goin said again that she had inquired about a regular steel door but found it would require different configuration while the proposed door would use the same motor and key pad.

Kathy Walters said she had no objection to a steel door, but the door's resemblance to wood would make it look more appropriate for its adjacency to what is basically a residential building.

Ms. Goin testified, in response to Jack Errante's question of color, that they were thinking of going with white as is the existing door; however, if the Commission prefers another color there would be no objection. She said the entrance door on the building is also white.

Judy Kandl stated that she thinks the original door would have been wood which means they are being asked to approve a substitute material. She read from the guidelines New Construction and Additions – Additions, guideline 7, page 45: *Contemporary substitute materials may be used on a limited basis, but should not make up the majority of the finish materials on a project. In order to qualify for use in new construction, substitute materials must have a demonstrated record of overall quality and durability. The physical properties of substitute materials must be similar to those of the historic materials they mimic. When considering substitute materials, the closer an element is to the viewer, the more closely the material and craftsmanship should match the original. Careful consideration should be given to the placement of substitute materials in relation to historic materials on the original structure to ensure that the transition is differentiated but not distracting otherwise visually unattractive. Substitute materials should not result in unnecessary damage to adjacent historic materials during installation or over time. The appropriateness of substitute materials shall be reviewed on an individual basis.*

She said the Commission should not take into account the consideration of the cost of one thing over the other, but only with what is compatible with the building.

Ms. Goin said, "We chose the door we did because we thought it would be compatible."

Another consideration, Ms. Kandl said, is the actual design of the door. She said, in her opinion it is not an appropriate door for a structure that was commercial in nature, especially the 6 handles. She said the building is a commercial structure that is being used as residential.

Ms. Goin said, "We can take all of them off."

Ms. Kandl said on the back of the building there is a steel door and it is the context of the building and a part of the evolution of the history of the building. And, she continued, the others in the neighborhood are metal that look like metal.

Anne Waters agreed that the handles were inappropriate but did not have a problem with the hinges. She stated that neither did she have a problem with the photo of the door that was submitted by Ms. Goin. She also said the raised panels were fine with her as shown in the CAD drawing

Anne Waters expressed her desire of the solid panels.

Ms. Goin stated that she could probably get the door without the wood embossment so that it would be plain if that was the Commission's preference.

The chair called for the motion which was made as follows by Kathy Walters: "I move that the Commission find the following facts concerning Application #H-19-08 – that Celia Goin, applicant for Cheerwine Homeowners Association, owner of 322 E. Council St., appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the non-original garage door on the building, that no one appeared before the Commission to support or oppose this request, this request should be granted based on The Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, and Chapter 2 – Changes to Buildings – Windows and Doors, pages 30-31, guidelines 1,2, and 3 of the Non-Residential Historic District Design Guidelines; therefore, I further move that a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application #H-19-08 be granted to Celia Goin, applicant for Cheerwine Homeowners Association, owner of 322 E. Cemetery Street to make the changes agreed to by the applicant – that the doors that will be installed will be a steel door similar to the CAD drawing that was brought before the Commission but without the inner wood detail of the recessed panels and without the wrought iron hardware, and the color to be white."

Ronald Fleming seconded the motion; all members present voted AYE.

### **Other Business**

Minor works: The minor works were approved as presented.

### **Minutes**

The minutes of the June called meeting were approved as amended following a motion from Kathy Walters, seconded by Jack Errante. All member present voted AYE.

### **Adjournment**

There being no other business to come before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 6:06 p.m.

---

Anne Lyles, Chairperson

---

Judy Jordan, Secretary